

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Carl Dante Johnson,)	C/A No.: 1:15-4942-RMG-SVH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	ORDER
Director Bryan P. Sterling and Corporal)	
Harold Campbell,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Carl Dante Johnson (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging violations of his constitutional rights. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, for summary judgment on August 19, 2016. [ECF No. 37]. As Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising him of the importance of the motion and of the need for him to file an adequate response by September 26, 2016. [ECF No. 38]. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, Defendants’ motion may be granted. *Id.*

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court’s *Roseboro* order, Plaintiff failed to properly respond to the motion. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the motion and wishes to abandon this action. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff is directed to advise the court whether he wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to Defendants’ motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, for summary judgment by October 11, 2016. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to

respond, this action will be recommended for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.



September 27, 2016
Columbia, South Carolina

Shiva V. Hodges
United States Magistrate Judge